



The Great Ottoman / Turkish Civilisation





Editor-in-chief
PROF. KEMAL ÇİÇEK

Co-editors
PROF. ERCÜMENT KURAN
PROF. NEJAT GÖYÜNÇ
PROF. İLBER ORTAYLI

Executive Editor
GÜLER EREN

VOLUME I
POLITICS

VOLUME II
ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

VOLUME III
PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE
AND
INSTITUTIONS

VOLUME IV
CULTURE AND ARTS



TECHNICAL COORDINATION
ABDURRAHMAN EREN

TYPE SETTING
ALİ TAŞTEPE / Ö. FARUK TAŞTEPE / ADEM TEMİZKÖK
ALİ ŞİMŞİR / EMRE TAŞTEPE / EMİNE GÜRLEK
HAMZA GÖRER

PROOF READING
ÖZLEM DİLMEN / HALİT ÜNSAL / MERİÇ ÖNDER
AHMET KARAÇAVUŞ / BANU ULU / ÇAĞLAYAN ENGİNAY
ALİ ÖMÜRBAY / AYTAÇ İNCEDAL / ESRA ÖZYURT
NURKANAT ABDURRAZAKOV / DUYGU ULU
HASAN MUTLU / SEMİH NART

GRAPHIC DESIGN
GÖKÇEN TEKNİK / SEMİH OFSET

TYPING
GÖKÇEN TEKNİK

PRINTED AT
SEMİH OFSET

BOUNDING HOUSE
BALKAN CİLTEVİ

ISBN 975-6782-17-X (TKNO)
975-6782-18-8 (VOL I)

ANKARA 2000



THE ORIENTATION OF THE İSTANBUL ARMENIAN PATRIARCHATE TOWARDS THE INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS (1850-1896)

ASST. PROF. DR. DAVUT KILIÇ
FIRAT UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF DIVINITY / ELAZIĞ - TURKEY

In the first quarter of the 19th century, Christian Europe had succeeded in converting, thanks to Christian missionaries, some of the Ottoman Armenians to Catholicism in order to exploit them in the Oriental Problem. Later, Europe incised this subtle issue, not only nurturing dislike within the Gregorian Armenian society, but also in the Ottoman state, by using the Armenians as the brokers of western capitalism trading within the Ottoman state. In the year 1830, the Vatican and France became the protectors of convert Christian-Armenians in the East. States such as Russia, Britain, and America observed this process, and having imperialist desires on the Ottoman state, focused on the Armenian society without further ado, just as the Vatican and France formerly did, and tried to attract followers to their own sects.

Britain, grasping the pivotal role of religion in the Middle East, albeit a bit late, managed to open the very first Protestant church in Jerusalem in 1842, as a result of the pressure put on the Ottoman state, starting from the 19th century onwards.¹ This policy, which Britain launched by opening Protestant churches and high schools, and which was used as a tool for interfering in the internal affairs of the Ottoman state, became influential, first and foremost, among the Armenians, just as was the case in the conversion to Catholicism.² After the rush towards the Catholic faith among some Gregorian Armenians, the emergence of Protestant movements within the same community not only irritated the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate,³ but it also tore apart the sectarian unity that had existed among the Armenian communities.⁴

Due to the intense missionary activities of the imperialist states in the Gregorian Armenian society, which was made up of citizens of the Ottoman state, and as a result of the Ottomans' protective policy, the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate was split into three. In 1830, the Catholic Armenian Church and in 1850 the Protestant Armenian Church were established.⁵ That the Sublime Porte (*Bab-ı Ali*) had to recognize the activities of the Churches and their parishes in the territories of the Ottoman Empire as a result of the official and unofficial pressure of imperialist states, intensified the rivalry among Christian sects. All these developments increased the uneasiness of the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate.⁶

Inspired by the movements of independence in the Balkans and the winds of nationalism that were sweeping across the Europe of the time, the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate veered towards Armenian nationalism with all its strength, in order to regain its former influence over the community and to congregate the scattered Armenian society within such an environment. To this end, the most noteworthy support to the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, in political terms, came from the imperialist states. In the missionary schools opened by the imperialist states⁷ within the territories of the Ottoman state, the independence of the Armenian society was indoctrinated and backed up. To put it more clearly, as a means of salvation, by exercising their worldly powers alongside their spiritual ones, the Armenian patriarchs inaugurated the orchestration of nationalistic movements with great enthusiasm, in the hope that they co-



uld unite the tripartite Armenian society around a new ideal. The İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate used to warmly welcome the idea of an independent, or at least an autonomous Armenia, to be set up by imperialistic states. By the same token, the Patriarchate became a voluntary tool in the game played for high stakes; the future of the Ottoman state,⁸ as well as that of Armenian society.⁹

Upon the promulgation of the Declaration of Reformation of 1856, Armenians for independence aimed at crushing the dominance of the nobles and restructuring the post of the Patriarchate, by drafting a new 'Mandate on the Armenian Nation'. The Armenian Nation Mandate was penned in an atmosphere of human rights and freedom, ushered in by the Declaration of Reformation and ratified by the Supreme Porte on 19 March 1862. From this date on, the election of the Armenian Patriarch was at the disposal of the members of the new Assembly.¹⁰ In this era, the concepts of 'enlightened' and 'retrogressive' became popular among the Armenians. *Amirals* (bankers) were regarded as pro-Ottoman retrogrades, and those who stood behind national aspirations were dubbed as 'enlightened'. The latter wanted to bring about an İstanbul Patriarch who would stand for national causes and follow policies in accordance with their desires. At last, after protracted debates and discussions, the idea of independence sparked in the eyes of the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, thanks to the influence of the enlightened. The famous Hrimyan, - who was to play an extremely important role in the recognition of autonomy of the Armenian society in the prevailing atmosphere and especially at the Berlin conference, was chosen as the Patriarch.¹¹

The rationale of the ratification of the mandate was to lessen the pressures made on the Ottoman state. Nevertheless, the mandate opened new vistas before the political and social organization of the Armenians.¹² With a new amendment, 'the Armenian society', went beyond the strengths of a community and became a new pressure group within the State, working for the actions and rights relating to political, social, economic and cultural aspects.¹³ This event eased the way for the imperialist states, who had the intention of interfering with the internal affairs of the state to protect their interests in the

territories of the Ottoman states. Accordingly, the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, which was once set up to administer religious and social affairs in the Gregorian Armenian society, was presented as a post directing national and political independent movements.¹⁴ This was entirely against the legal rationale behind the establishment of such an institution.¹⁵

Citing from the work of K. Ozanyan, 'Historical Duty of the Armenians', A. Hulki Saral lists the benefits of 'The Mandate of the Armenian Nation' to the Armenians as follows: The mandate gave rise to the opening of a number of schools and cultural institutions; it amounted to a forward movement towards western civilization and education; it accustomed Armenians to election methods and endeavour; the mandate gave the power to lodge complaints collectively and the stamina to activate their power to awaken the slumbering spirit of revolution; it kept the Armenian issue on the agenda and provided the unity of the tripartite Armenian communities (namely Catholic, Protestant and Gregorians (*Lusavarçagan*)) in those hard times.¹⁶ As Ozanyan remarked with pride, the mandate that the Ottoman state enacted was used by the Armenian Patriarchs as a step towards the independence movement and political strife, rather than as a means to achieve the prosperity of the said communities. The clergy were not satisfied with the aforesaid achievements and received help from Europe and Russia to establish an autonomous Armenia, based on Armenian nationalism.¹⁷ Mayewski summarizes this period in the following words: "The efforts of the Armenian spiritual leaders with regard to religion is almost non-existent. Nevertheless, they have ardently striven to spread nationalist thoughts".¹⁸

The spiritual leaders of the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate pretended to be performing mundane religious activities; whereas they allocated all their time to activities that would bring about the resurgence of a national awakening within the limits of the provisions of the Mandate on the Armenian Nation.¹⁹ Not only did they sow the seeds of enmity in the activities carried out in monasteries, in churches and at schools, but they also gave rise to the development of independence movements within the Armenian community. The independence and



nationalist tendencies pursued by the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate and their fathers were supported by missionary activities orchestrated by the imperialist states on the Gregorian Armenians.²⁰ The propaganda activities, with religious motifs, concentrated on the Armenian community, paving the way to political and national themes. As a result of these developments, schools opened by Catholic and Protestant missionaries helped to serve the efforts of the Armenian religious leaders.²¹

In 1876, a memorandum drafted by the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate was submitted to the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs.²² In consequence thereof, the British solicited the Ottoman Armenian community to lodge complaints against the Ottomans, in such a way as to support the memorandum. Thus, the Armenian religious leaders, by not heeding the ongoing sectarian strife within the Armenian community, directed themselves towards the passion for political independence, in order to regain their personal influence and the Patriarchate's old power. As time passed, national feelings melted down to religious fanaticism.²³ As Armenian clergymen had virtually no religious concerns, Armenian nationalists managed to mesmerize the Armenian priests in a very short span of time.²⁴

On the insistence of the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, the Russians added an article concerning the Armenians in the Ayastefanos Treaty. Accordingly, the name of the Armenians was enunciated for the first time in an international treaty. This resulted in the raising of the political expectations of the Armenian community; expectations of becoming an independent nation free from the trusteeship of Russia and the European nations. This also caused the softening of conflicts resulting from the sectarian strife between the Armenian communities and the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate. From this time on, the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate started overtly struggling for political independence against the Ottoman state, with the support of the imperialist states. A committee, under the leadership of Patriarch Nerses, among whom there were prominent figures of the İstanbul Armenian community, came to Ayestefenos (Yeşilköy - a borough in İstanbul) and wanted help from Russia to set up autonomous Armenian states in the region cove-

ring Sivas, Erzurum, Van and Muş, demanding that the Tsar's army prolong their presence in the region. On the way to independence, the confluence or juxtaposition of the interests of the Armenian community and those of the imperialist states, which had policies concerning the Ottoman states, resulted in the establishment of bilateral relations again.²⁵

Before the convention of the Berlin Conference, Hrimyan invited all the episcopacy to his house in Kuzguncuk. After elucidating that he did not approve of the policy of Patriarch Nerses, he suggested that a new figure, with a renewed spirit, should be elected as Patriarch. Thereafter, he put forward the name of İzmirliyan. Patriarch Nerses, who was irritated by this event, declared that wherever the interest of the Armenian community was, he would be there. He requested that the episcopacy help him in this regard. Nerses, reorienting his policy upon the criticisms of Hrimyan, toiled with all of his stamina to draw the Armenian problem to the attention of the international circles.

Soon after the Berlin Conference (13 July 1878), the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate started preparing revolutionary and rebellious activities throughout the country.²⁶ As a result of the pressures of Patriarch Hrimyan, the would-be Patriarch İzmirliyan and the members of the Assembly of the Patriarchate, Patriarch Nerses did the rounds of the foreign missions to draw their attention to the cause.²⁷

In 1879 nationalist feeling had developed dominantly among the Armenian clergymen. The Armenian episcopacy declared that they wanted the right to announce their own national identity and the right to have national autonomy. The İstanbul Armenian Patriarch explicitly spelled out the right of the Armenian community to detach itself from the Ottoman Empire.²⁸

A communiqué, dated 5 May 1879, written in the spirit of independence and sent to all the Ottoman Armenians, via the churches by the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, was captured by the police in Sivas. In the communiqué, it was written that.

"The attached directive of significance, adopted on the decision of the Reformation Commission, was sent to you as it has been sent to all the episcopacy. Act correctly and



promptly. The Nation has undertaken the task of reformation and of doing away with the torture and maltreatment that Armenians were subjected to in the most dangerous times of our history. This is a duty of becoming a nation. Provided that the consideration of this issue scratches the mind of all, it could lead to a split among the nation. This will damage the Armenian cause. Congregate all Armenians, regardless of whether you be Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox or any other, at least for the time being, on this common cause and become united, so letting the Armenian cause live and not go astray.

Indoctrinate even the students in the schools with the Armenian cause. In villages where there are no schools or teachers, priests should teach both boys and girls at least how to write their names. In addition, both in cities and in villages, illiterate people should be taught how to read and write. At the very least, they should be able to sign their names, as this will be essential in the future. European states sent consulates from every corner of Anatolia. Armenian assemblies and chairmen should make frequent contact with them. They should establish close relations with them and be able to disclose every issue of the Armenian nation to these consulates; our problems should not be disadvantageously narrated by foreign mouths. If this is the case, then Europe will protect the rights of the Armenians, regardless of sectarian differences, and back us. The civilized nations of Europe are prepared to do this. According to article 61 of the Final Act of the Berlin Conference, the hearing and healing of the sorrows of Christian Armenians should be settled upon the rights of majority. We start without fail to present this majority to the consulate and to show that we are entitled to obtain this right and that we are talented and honest. By showing our thirst for knowledge, we show them that we desire reformation and security.

You should show the innate nature of the hospitality of the Armenians by entertaining, with smiling faces, any European visitors you run into. Tell them ancient Armenian sagas; it is essential that you help the Armenian cause in this way. Tell them of the real situation of Armenia today, you should seek their help. Let these people recognize the parish community and advise them. If European travellers become sick or needy, dash to their help, so that you win their hearts. Although you do not need such advice, however, do not be afraid; in case old Muslim atrocities have left indelible scars in your memories, those days are gone now. You should establish very close and intimate relationships with Christian European travellers.

We feel obliged to send this communiqué to you for the reasons alluded to above. The Ottoman state shall not be an obstacle to the warm relations you are likely to establish with European travellers. If anyone is subjected to torture or atrocities, he should lodge a complaint with the local government. Moreover, the nearest consulate should be notified, without fail. Such incidents should be sent in writing to the Patriarchate with all the details."²⁹

Signature Patriarch Nerses Varjabetyan

In his memories, Tahsin Pasha writes about the attitudes and policies adopted by the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate and Armenian clergymen when they received the news that in the Armenian revolts priests played grand roles and churches became the focal points of wickedness and terrorism, rather than worship.³⁰ Nevertheless, they failed to find any clues, due to the well-laid plans of the Armenian revolutionaries, helped by some consulates.³¹ In addition to this, it is known that the revolutionaries and the people involved in these events usually took refuge in the Patriarchate's churches and other Armenian churches, and were hidden by priests and porters. Spiritual leaders put the fundamentals of their religion to one side, and took for granted that nationalism and independence were the only way to salvation. Their ideas, due to the religious ranks and posts they held, had a significant influence on their parishes.

On 20 June 1890, the Ottoman soldiers were fired upon when they approached the Saint Asalyan Church in Erzurum to search the premises upon information received. Two officers and one gendarmerie soldier were killed. After the search, weapons and other ammunition, brought clandestinely from Russia, were confiscated.³² Hrimyan, after leaving his Patriarchal post, acted together with the rebellious forces and aided them in communication with one another. The Armenians, preparing for revolution and directed by the Hınçak Committee, tread on the *Tuğra*, the ornamental monogram of the Sultans, and tore it apart, under the influence of the fiery sermons delivered at the Kumkapı Church in 1890. After this, the protestors, headed by the Patriarch, started to march towards the Supreme Porte to make their complaints. After precautions were taken, the protestors were disbanded and the Patriarch Aşıkyan, who had foreseen this ill-planned protest, had to resign.³³



In 1894, İzmirliyan, elected under the aegis of the Hınçak Committee as the İstanbul Patriarch, shouldered the leadership of the Committee. In consequence, the leadership of the Patriarchy and the Committee became intermingled. From that time onwards, the Committee intensified³⁴ its activities throughout every corner of the country. İzmirliyan, in his patriarchy era, gained notoriety due to his ardent efforts to instigate rebellion amongst the Armenian community against the Ottoman state. The Armenians dubbed him the *Iron Patriarch*.³⁵

The İstanbul Armenian Patriarch, infused with the dream of an independent Armenian state, reported before the superintendent, charging him that he did not use the influence of the Patriarchy to further the anarchy and terror organized by the Armenians, adding that if the Armenians were to agitate and go beyond the borders, he would not be responsible for the consequences.³⁶ After this, the Minister of the Security Forces (*Zaptiye Nazırı*), Nazım Pasha, sent a letter to the Grand Vizier, Halil Rıfat Pasha, urging that the Patriarch should be called to serenity and loyalty, in that the Patriarch established the course for action for the Armenian community, and it was at his disposal whether a new incident were to arise or not.³⁷

In this letter sent to the Grand Vizier, Halil Rıfat Pasha, dated 28 June 1895, the Minister of the Security Forces, Nazım Pasha depicts the relations of İzmirliyan with the Ottoman state thus: In the time of the former Patriarch, the delivery of sermons and the utterance of advice, articulating the hatred of the Armenian nations towards the attitudes of the wicked and the chiefs of the committees were, to a large extent, prevented.³⁸ While this state backed up severe measures, the courage of the committees was weakened, the former Patriarch had to resign after he faced an assassination attempt. As to how he had been chosen is unknown, but Mateos İzmirliyan changed his attitude towards the government after he became Patriarch. He removed the personnel loyal to the Ottoman state, one after another. He ventured to object to the government, gaining courage from the interference of foreign states into the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. The Hınçak Committee put those Armenians who were loyal to the State under great pressure, and

killed some of them. Thus, the Hınçak Committee and the Patriarchate were preparing to instigate revolt among the Armenians towards the State. İzmirliyan blurred the minds of the Armenian people living in Adana and Halep, after managing to get Aletciyan Kirkois as Sis Katogikos elected, albeit with deceit and tricks.³⁹

The İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate, in order to achieve its goal, removed the Armenians and priests who were residing in Anatolia with pro-Ottoman views. In their place, it tried to assign pro-independence staff to similar posts, no matter how the Ottoman state protested against such action.⁴⁰ The priest Vartan, who was assigned to the Muş episcopacy, and was well known for his opposition to the Ottoman state, betrayed other priests who were loyal to the Ottoman state. In the end the betrayed priests were summoned, by force, to İstanbul and it was attempted to suppress their loyalty.⁴¹ On the other side of the spectrum, those episcopacy known for pro-independence sinisterly performed their missions in the eastern part of Anatolia, in accordance with the programme given by the Patriarchate.⁴² In the congregation held in the Beyoğlu Church in İstanbul, sending a message to the Muş episcopacy, the Armenian Patriarch, whose actions were persistent, despite the attitude of the Ottoman state, wanted to increase charitable collections by boosting public feeling with fierce speeches during the ritual ceremony to be convened on the anniversary of the Sason case.⁴³

The İstanbul Armenian Patriarch sent a letter to the foreign embassies saying that he considered that his community was on the brink of revolution. As he had no power to subjugate them, he wanted the help of the European states. The motive of such a recourse was to prepare a platform for internal chaos, and for the Armenian actions, as well as to try to gain the support of the Europeans and Russia against the Ottoman state.⁴⁴

As E. Uras narrates, S. Kaprielyan exalts the activities of İzmirliyan in his book entitled 'the Armenian Crisis and its Re-birth':

"...On the other hand, the İstanbul Patriarch İzmirliyan used to engage incessantly in courageous activities. He had unprecedented support. He directed a memorandum to the Sublime Porte demanding that the reformati-



on should be applied as soon as possible, otherwise the Armenians would not be responsible for the results."

Kaprielyan remarks that this memorandum angered the sultan.⁴⁵

On 18 September 1895, while leaving the Patriarchate's Church in Kumkapı, some four thousand Armenians sang songs, shouting '*Long Live the Patriarch*' and '*Long Live Armenia*'.⁴⁶ The Armenians had been increasingly arrogant after the enactment of the decree (*ferman*) of concession. The Armenians caused many hardships in the effort of reform. Moreover, they used to complain about fictitious cases in front of the consulates, just as they resisted the order they had received from the Patriarch.⁴⁷ The strenuous efforts and advice of the Armenian clergymen were the primary reasons for the western states' approval.⁴⁸ Priest Dergort, one of the revolutionary Armenians, was arrested with some documents on him, and he confessed that the İstanbul Armenians were corresponding with the leader of the rebels of Zeytun, and had adopted the goals of Armenian revolutionaries and independence movements.⁴⁹

As to the rebellious movements in Zeytun, at the beginning the events had no real goal, but were merely looting and theft. Later, the Patriarch motivated them into a systematic rebellious movement, heading towards independence. The Patriarchate manipulated these rebellious attacks for precisely 65 years.⁵⁰

It was only after September 1896 that Patriarch İzmirlıyan was exiled to Jerusalem after he was dismissed by the Ottoman state, in as much as he insisted on expressing his opinions and did not give up agitating for the Armenian community.⁵¹ Kamuran Gürün elaborates the

problem of Armenian clergymen and churches in the following sentences: "To put it more clearly, one should not speak of the Armenian nation, Armenian state and Armenian history. Rather the crux of all was the Armenian canonical state. In order to preserve its existence, the Armenian Church was in need of a state. The emergence of the idea of the Armenian state is rooted in the Armenian Church rather than the Armenian nation"

To sum up, in the light of all the information and documents presented here, it is pertinent to indicate that it is the İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate and some of its clergymen, rather than the Ottoman Armenian community, that were responsible for the planning and directing of the independence movement. It can be plainly understood from the Ottoman archives that, in order to unite the then Armenian community under the banner of the independence movement, which was losing its spirit, churches were to be used as the centres of revolts. The Armenian Patriarchate, which governed the Armenian Community for many years in the Ottoman territories, wanted to regain its fading and tarnished prestige and to prevent the tripartite stratification of the Armenian community.⁵²

To this end, it persistently supported the independence movements. This was because the Patriarchate and spiritual leaders were absolutely convinced that only through this means was it possible to regain its disappearing authority. As the interests of the Patriarchy and clergymen superseded over those of the Armenian community, this hostile policy and these actions that were pursued against the Ottoman state deeply affected not only the Ottoman state, but also the Armenian community.

1 For a general information, see. Davut Kılıç, "XIX. Asırda İngiltere'nin Ortadoğu Politikasının Osmanlı Ermenilerine Yansıması", *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, p. 117, Aralık 1998, p. 89-98.

2 Fahir H. Armaoğlu, *Siyasi Tarih*, (Ankara, 1964), p. 289.

3 *İstanbul Armenian Patriarchate* disturbed by the activities of the Catholic missionaries, applied to the sultan by complaining that some Armenians converted to Catholic. The Patriarch demanded the sultan to punish the missionaries claiming that the Catholic missionaries tried to convert the Christian *reaya* in the Ottoman lands to their own sect upon the order of the Papa. Then, the Ottoman government had to take some measures to prevent the conversion of the *reaya*. The sultan ordered that measures be

taken in accordance with the *ferman* so that those who changed their sect returned to their own sect. See Ahmet Refik, *Hicri on ikinci asırda İstanbul Hayatı* (1100-1200). (İstanbul, 1930), p.21. Also, the first reaction to the American missionaries was from *İstanbul Armenian Patriarch* in fear of a decrease in population due to the Armenians converted to Protestantism and losing the political influence on the Armenian society. The *Patriarch* even sentenced the Armenians converted to Protestantism to death penalty. However, the american missionaries and Gregorian Armenians became closer after the american tradesmen and Armenian brokers worked together. Therefore, the opinions of the missionaries were easily spread among the Armenian society. See *General Har-*



- bord'un Anadolu Gezisi ve Ermeni Meselesine Dair Raporu*, İstanbul 1981, p. 12 cf.
- 4 For a general information, see. Davut Kılıç, *Osmanlı İdaresindeki Ermeniler Arasında Dini ve Siyasi Mücadeleler*, (Elazığ 1999), p. 145.
- 5 D. Kılıç, *ibid.*, p. 157-161.
- 6 D. Kılıç, *ibid.*, p. 172.
- 7 Cevdet Küçük, "Van'daki Ermeni İsyanları", *Yakın Tarihimizde Van Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, (Ankara 1990), p. 137.
- 8 According to the Sublime Porte, most of the Armenians were innocent in both clashes of sect and interest, and rivalries and terrorist activities within the Armenian society. These were all caused by a small group of church administrators who wanted to obtain some benefits through the competition. Between the churches or who acted as the agents of the imperialist states and of rebellions and terrorists who got into the Ottoman territory from abroad. See Cengiz Kürşat, "Ermeni Terörü", *Ottoman Archives Yıldız Collection The Armenian Question I*, İstanbul 1989, p. 10. Kamuran Gürün, *Ermeni Dosyası*, (Ankara 1988), p. 57.
- 10 M. Kemal Öke, *Ermeni Sorunu (1914-1923)*, Ankara 1991, p. 71; For a general information, see. Abdurrahman Küçük, *Ermeni Kilişisi ve Türkler*, (Ankara 1997), p. 196.
- 11 Esat Uras, *Ermeniler* (Türk Tarihinin Ana hatları Eserinin Müsveddeleri No: 6), ? 1933, p. 17 cf. Nejat Göyünç, *Osmanlı İdaresinde Ermeniler*, (İstanbul 1983), p. 55.
- 12 İhsan Sakarya, *Belgelerle Ermeni Sorunu*, Ankara 1984, p. 34; Nizamnamenin tamamı için bkz.: Esat Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler ve Ermeni Meselesi*, (İstanbul 1987), p. 156 vd.
- 13 *Ottoman Archives Yıldız Collection The Armenian Question III*, (Araştırmalar ve Dökümantasyon Merkezi Kurma ve Geliştirme Vakfı) (İstanbul 1989), p. 15.
- 14 For a general information, see. D. Kılıç, *ibid.*, p. 39-43.
- 15 Dikran Kevorkyan, "Uluslararası Terör Karşısında Türk Ermenilerinin Düşüncesi", *Türk Tarihinde Ermeniler Sempozyumu*, (İzmir 1983), p. 116; E. Uras, *Ermeniler*, p. 16.
- 16 Ahmet Hulki Saral, *Ermeni Meselesi*, (Ankara 1970), p. 51.
- 17 Mehmet Hocaoglu, *Arşiv Vesikalarıyla Ermeni Mezalimi ve Ermeniler*, İstanbul 1976, p. 35 vd.
- 18 Mayewski, *Ermenilerin Yaptıkları Katliamlar*, (nşr. A. Süslü), Ankara 1986, p. 14.
- 19 Hidayet Vahapoğlu, *Osmanlılardan Günümüze Azınlık ve Yabancı Okullar*, Ankara 1990, p. 11.
- 20 Mehmet Etemoğlu, *Ermeni Terörünün Kısa Tarihi*, Diyarbakır 1987, p. 14; E. Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler...*, p. 106 cf.
- 21 General Mayewski, *Van, Bitlis Vilayetleri-Askeri İstatistiği*, (Sadık Bey), (İstanbul 1330), p. 123 vd.
- 22 It was article 16 in the treaty signed. For the text of the treaty, see. Reşat Ekrem, *Osmanlı Mubadeleri ve Kapitülasyonlar (1300-1920)*, (İstanbul 1934), p. 218 vd.
- 23 Yuluğ Tekin Kurat, *Henry Layard'ın İstanbul Elçiliği (1877-1880)*, (Ankara 1968), p. 158.
- 24 *Türkler-Ermeniler ve Avrupa*, (nşr. B. Kodaman), (Ankara 1994), p. 24.
- 25 E. Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler...*, p. 211.
- 26 M. Hocaoglu, *ibid.*, p. 181.
- 27 Azmi Süslü, *Ermeniler ve 1915 Tehcir Olayı*, (Ankara 1990), p. 59.
- 28 Justin McCarthy, *Ölüm ve Sürgün*, (tr. Bilge Umar), (İstanbul 1998), p. 128.
- 29 BOA, Yıldız Evrakı, Kısım: 24.
- 30 *Tahtsin Paşanın Yıldız Hatıraları Sultan Abdülmecid*, (nşr. B. Tahtsin), (İstanbul 1990), p. 59 vd.
- 31 Hüseyin Nazım Paşa, *Ermeni Olayları Tarihi II*, (Ankara 1994), p. 232.
- 32 A. Süslü, *ibid.*, p. 42.
- 33 *Ermeni Komitelerinin İhtilal Hareketleri ve Besledikleri Emeller*, (nşr. İsmet Parmaksızoglu), (Ankara 1981), p. 17.
- 34 A. Alper Gazigiray, *Ermeni Terörünün Kaynakları*, (İstanbul 1982), p. 101 vd.
- 35 Esat Uras, "Ermeni Cemiyetleri", *Ottoman Archives Yıldız Collection The Armenian Question III*, (İstanbul 1989), p. 19 vd.
- 36 Hüseyin Nazım Paşa, *Ermeni Olayları Tarihi I*, (Ankara 1994), p. 73.
- 37 BOA, BEO, Mühimme Kalemi, A- Dersaadet, İç no: 21, Karton no: 101, Evrak no: 7669.
- 38 H. Nazım Paşa, *ibid.*, I, p. 64 vd.
- 39 From Cevdet Pasha to Nazım Pasha (30 April 1895), BOA, BEO, Mühimme Kalemi, A-Papazlar, Karton no: 36, Evrak no: 5242 / 83.
- 40 From Said Pasha to Rıza Pasha and Turhan Pasha, (27 June 1895), BOA, BEO, Mühimme Kalemi, A- Murahhasa ve Papazlar, Karton no: 36, Evrak no: 5782 / 333.
- 41 *Ermeni Komitelerinin İhtilal...*, p. 14.
- 42 From Said Pasha to Rıza Pasha (25 August 1895), BOA, Mühimme Kalemi, A-Papazlar, Karton no: 36, Evrak no: 6146 / 521.
- 43 From Halil Rıfat to Talisın Pasna (14 December 1895), BOA, Yıldız Sadet Resmi, Dosya no: 77, Sıra no: 56, Evrak no: 1507.
- 44 From Kamil Pasna to the Chief Secretary of Mabeyn, BOA, Yıldız Sadet Hususi, Dosya no: 24-Za-1508, İç no: 1.
- 45 E. Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler...*, p. 478.
- 46 E. Uras, *Tarihte Ermeniler...*, p. 481.
- 47 From Şakir Pasha, the inspector of Anatolian Provinces, to the Chief Secretary of Mabeyn, (27 September 1895), BOA, Yıldız Esas Evrakı, Karton: 81, Klasör: 31, İç no: 10-Z-76, Evrak no: 76 / 4.
- 48 G. Mayewski, *Van Bitlip...*, p. 129.
- 49 From Zihni Pasha, the Vail of Halep to Memduh Pasna, the Minister of Home Affairs, (19 Aralık 1895), BOA, BEO, MHEM, A- Halep, Karton no: 42, Evrak no: 7893, İç no: 2.
- 50 *Ermeni Komitelerinin İhtilal...*, p. 20 For a general information, see. Erdal İler, *Ermeni Meselesinin Perspektifi ve Zengin İsyanları (1780-1880)*, (Ankara 1988), p. 67-126.
- 51 *Ermeni Komitelerinin İhtilal...*, p. 20.
- 52 Kamuran Gürün, "Ermeni Sorunu Yoktur Bir Sorun Nasıl Yarattır", *Türk Tarihinde Ermeniler Sempozyumu*, (İzmir 1983), p. 30.